DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 251 532 UD 023 890

AUTHOR Bailis, Lawrence Neil
TITLE Study of the Status of FY83 CETA Coordination and Program Activities. Final Report: Coordination Study.
INSTITUTION National Commission for Employment Policy (DOL), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO RR-84-05
PUB DATE May 84
NOTE 60p.; For a related document, see UD 023 891.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperative Programs; *Coordination; *Employment Programs; *Federal Programs; Job Placement; *Job Training; *Program Effectiveness; Secondary Education; Transitional Programs; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; Job Training Partnership Act 1982; Work Incentive Program

ABSTRACT

This report examines the status of coordination at State and local levels between the activities funded by the Service Delivery Areas and other employment and training programs on the one hand, and between these programs and private sector employers on the other. The status of coordination in Fiscal 1983, the last year of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA), is analyzed in order to lay the groundwork for future assessments of the effectiveness of the new Federal Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) in improving coordination. Specific mechanisms to promote coordination as well as factors hampering it are reviewed. The highest levels of coordination are found to have been with public education agencies and public employment. The most striking finding for future employment and training systems is said to be the low level of coordination encountered with the Work Incentive (WIN) program, which was also the program with the fewest coordination mechanisms. It is determined that coordination between CETA Prime Sponsors and other agencies was generally good, although the presence of coordinating structures was not always accompanied by mechanisms to promote the results of coordination. The report concludes by recommending that further attention be paid to factors that have promoted and impeded coordination between Prime Sponsors and the public Employment Service. (RDN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Research Report

ED251532

STUDY OF THE STATUS OF FY 83
CETA COORDINATION AND
PROGRAM ACTIVITIES
FINAL REPORT:
COORDINATION STUDY

Lawrence Neil Bailis

May 1984 RR-84-05

UD023 890

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

NCEP
National Commission for Employment Policy • 1522 K Street N.W. • Suite 300 • Washington, D.C. 20005

STUDY OF THE STATUS OF FY 83 CETA COORDINATION AND PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

FINAL REPORT: COORDINATION STUDY

Lawrence Neil Bailis

May 1984 RR-84-05

RESEARCH REPORT SERIES
NATIONAL COMMISSION
FOR EMPLOYMENT POLICY
1522 K STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

This paper contains a summary and analysis of information provided by 48 CETA Prime Sponsors, and would not have been possible without the willingness of the staff of those organizations to devote time and effort to this endeavor while facing major pressing management challenges.

Assistance in planning for the study and in techniques in data processing and analysis was provided by Howard Bloom. John Wallace of the National Commission for Employment Policy provided both broad and detailed oversight for all aspects of the study. Despite this assistance, opinions expressed in the paper are those of the author, and do not necessarily represent the official views of the National Commission for Employment Policy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
1.0	INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW	
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	JTPA and Coordination	2
1.3	Summary of Methodology	5
1.4	Organization of This Report	9
1.5	Highlights of Findings	10
2.0	STATUS OF COORDINATION IN FISCAL 1983	
2.1	Introduction and Overview	14
2.2	Perceived Levels of Coordination	15
2.3	Structures and Planning Procedures	18
2.4	Specific Mechanisms to Promote Coordination	22
2.5	Subcontracting with Other Agencies	23
2.6	Agency Specific Issues	26
3.0	THE DYNAMICS OF COORDINATION	
3.1	Introduction	32
3.2	Factors Hampering Coordination	32
3.3	Factors Promoting Coordination	34
4.0	IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY-MAKERS AND RESEARCHERS	
4.1	Introduction	36
4.2	Low Levels of Coordination with WIN	36
4.3	The Need for Further Attention to Coordination with the Employment Service	37
4.4	The Relationship between Coordination Mechanisms and Results	37
4.5	The Need for Continued Close Attention to Coordination	37
Appendix A:	PRIME SPONSOR SAMPLES	A-1
Appendix B:	COMPARISONS OF RANDOM SAMPLE AND LARGE PRIME SPONSOR GROUP	B-1
Appendix C:	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TESTS FROM CHAPTER 2	C-1

STUDY OF THE STATUS OF FY 83 CETA COORDINATION

Executive Summary

1.0 Introduction and Overview

The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) contains numerous provisions designed to promote improved coordination at State and local levels between the activities funded by Service Delivery Areas (SDAs) and other employment and training programs on the one hand, and between these programs and private sector employers on the other.

This study lays the groundwork for future efforts to estimate the impact of JTPA upon coordination by developing "baseline" data about the nature and extent of coordination in Fiscal 1983, the last year of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA). It specifically addresses coordination between CETA Prime Sponsors and programs or entities that were extensively addressed in the JTPA legislation, including:

- The Work Incentive (WIN) program,
- Other activities of welfare offices,
- The labor exchange activities of the public Employment Service (ES or Job Service),
- Vocational education,
- Other programs operated by public education agencies,
- Proprietary schools,
- Economic development agencies,
- Vocational rehabilitation agencies, and
- Private employers.*

2.0 Summary of Methodology

The study methodology included development of generic measures of coordination that would be applicable to any employment and training program, and efforts to obtain information concerning the status of coordination in a stratified random sample of fifty CETA Prime Sponsors in Fiscal 1983.

---

* Coordination with community based organizations (CBOs) was not a major focus of JTPA, and is therefore not addressed in this report. The involvement of CBOs in the FY 1983 CETA system is, however, addressed in detail in a companion final report for this study.

The measures that were utilized included overall assessments of the level of coordination, presence or absence of structures and planning procedures designed to promote overall coordination, and presence or absence of specific mechanisms to promote coordination.

A stratified random sample of fifty Prime Sponsors was selected so that an appropriate balance of types of Prime Sponsor and regions of the country would be insured. Usable information was provided by 45 of 50 Prime Sponsors in the sample, yielding a 90% response rate. A supplementary sample consisting of the five Prime Sponsors with the largest allocations of funding was also drawn, and usable information was obtained from three of them. five.

3.0 Highlights of Findings

Prime Sponsors generally report that the levels of coordination between their agency and others are "good", and that they have implemented planning procedures that are designed to promote broad-based coordination with other agencies. However, the perceptions of effective coordination and presence of these structures and procedures were not always accompanied by the presence of specific mechanisms to promote the desired results of coordination.

3.1 Perceptions of Current Levels of Coordination

- Current levels of overall coordination are generally described as "good" by the typical Prime Sponsor. The mean score for all Prime Sponsors and all agencies was 2.91 on a scale in which scores of 1, 2, 3, and 4 were given for non-existent coordination, minimal coordination, good coordination, and excellent coordination respectively.

- Prime Sponsors report having the highest levels of coordination with public education agencies (with a mean score of 3.14) and the public Employment Service (with a mean score of 3.11).

- The next highest levels are with agencies responsible for vocational education and with private employers (both with mean scores of 3.0).

- Prime Sponsors report substantially lower levels of coordination with the Work Incentive or WIN program (with a mean score of 2.25) than with other agencies and programs (with the next lowest score being 2.78).

- Between a third and a half of Prime Sponsors providing information feel that there is a need to improve coordination with WIN, ES, welfare, vocational education, and public education programs.

3.2 Structures and General Planning Procedures

- The overwhelming majority of Prime Sponsors have implemented procedures whose broad objectives involve promotion of coordination with related programs.

  --More than four-fifths of the Prime Sponsors providing information have input from vocational education (86%), private employers (81%), and the ES (81%) in their planning processes.

  --More than three-quarters of the Prime Sponsors providing information meet at least quarterly with ES (86%) and vocational education agencies (76%) for purposes of promoting coordination.

- All coordination mechanisms studied were found least frequently with the WIN program; such measures were often present less than half as often for WIN as for other programs. For example, only 26% of the Prime Sponsors reported input from WIN into their planning processes and only 29% reported meeting with WIN on at least a quarterly basis.

3.3 Specific Mechanisms to Promote Coordination

- Formal client referral agreements were present twice as frequently with ES offices than with any other type of agency, occurring in about 45% of the Prime Sponsors providing information on this topic. However, this finding means that such agreements are <u>not</u> present in five of every nine instances, and thus confirms the general impression that there is considerable room for increasing coordination with the local Job Service and its programs in most places.

- Client referral agreements were present with welfare agencies and vocational rehabilitation agencies the next most frequently, 21% of the time.

- Prime Sponsors were more likely to share common service boundaries with ES, welfare, and vocational education (24% of the time) than with other programs or agencies.

- Co-location of CETA offices with those of other agencies was present twice as frequently with the ES (36% of the time) than with any other type of agency. Public education agencies were the second most likely to be co-located with Prime Sponsors (17%), and welfare and vocational education programs were tied for third (12%).

- Joint funding agreements in which the Prime Sponsor and another agency both provide financial support for a program were relatively rare. They were encountered most frequently with vocational education (19% of the time) and economic development agencies (17%).

- Coordination is presumably furthered when Prime Sponsors subcontract with other agencies that have the capability to deliver services. The types of agencies or programs that were utilized the most frequently for each type of service are:

--Recruitment	ES	(48%)
--Intake	ES	(36%)
--Supportive services	ES	(17%)
--Classroom skills training	Voc. Ed.	(62%)
--Other classroom training	Public Ed.	(45%)
--OJT	Private employers	(57%)
--Work experience	Public Ed.	(12%)
--Job search assistance	ES	(26%)
--Job development	ES	(31%)

3.4 The Dynamics of Coordination

- Prime Sponsors report that the most frequently encountered barriers to improved coordination with other agencies are "turf problems" and conflicting laws, goals, and priorities among different agencies.

4.0 Implications for Policy-Makers and Future Researchers

Several study findings have clear implications for those who administer and those who study employment and training systems. Perhaps the most striking of these is the low levels of coordination encountered with the WIN program. The strong JTPA emphasis on reducing welfare dependency makes it imperative that close ties be developed and maintained between the administrative entities responsible for Service Delivery Areas and programs designed to help welfare recipients to get jobs.

Despite considerable ferment in the WIN system, the WIN program (and the related "WIN demonstration" programs that have replaced WIN in about half of the states) remains the focus of efforts to help welfare recipients obtain employment. Therefore, it seems clear that efforts to promote coordination with WIN should be a high priority for SDAs.

Secondly, coordination with the public Employment Service is relatively high--often the highest among the nine public and private agencies covered in this study--but it still far from universally realized. For example, despite the fact that client referral agreements were more frequently encountered with ES than with any other program or agency, such agreements were still present in fewer than half of the Prime Sponsors providing information.

Given the heavy emphasis on improving ties between Prime Sponsors and the Employment Service in the past, the levels of coordination discussed in this report suggest that further attention should be paid to this issue, and in particular, to the factors that have promoted and impeded such coordination in the past--and are likely to continue to do so in the future.

Third, it is noteworthy that the fact that coordinated planning is frequently encountered does not automatically translate into the frequent presence of the specific mechanisms to promote coordination. Both program administrators and operators would therefore do well to distinguish among means such as coordinated planning, intermediate mechanisms to promote coordination such as wirtten referral agreements, and ends such as improved service and/or reduced costs, and to focus their efforts on achieving the latter two.

Finally, the study findings point up that competition among agencies and/or differences in priorities between employment and training agencies and others are considered important barriers to improved coordination. These areas have been partially addressed in the JTPA legislation, and there is therefore some reason to expect that improvements in coordination will take place during the early years of implementation of the Act.

The best way to obtain reasonably accurate estimates of the degree to which these desired changes are taking place would be to replicate this study, obtaining information on the precise measures utilized in this study from the SDAs responsible for the same areas of the study Prime Sponsorships at some time in the next few years.

Chapter One

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

1.1 Introduction

The U.S. Department of Labor and state and local program operators have been attempting to promote greater coordination among employment and training programs for decades. The implementation of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) represents the latest in a long series of federally-initiated efforts to accomplish this objective, including the Concentrated Employment Program (CEP), the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System (CAMPS), and the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 (CETA).

The social science research literature is rich in studies that address the degree to which these previous efforts have been successful and analyze the factors that appear to promote and retard coordination. At the risk of oversimplification, it seems fair to say that the literature reveals that there is still considerable room for improvement in coordination of employment and training programs.*

The National Commission for Employment Policy (NCEP) has been deeply involved in planning for JTPA and in monitoring the transition from CETA to JTPA. Assessing the success of JTPA in promoting improved coordination has long been a major concern of the commission and has led directly to the funding of this study.

---

* A detailed summary of the findings from the research literature was included in a previous study deliverable, "Review Essay: Project B, Coordination Study", submitted to the National Commission for Employment Policy on September 8, 1983.

The NCEP assessment is being carried out through a straightforward four step procedure:

- Development of a set of generic measures of the status of coordination that are applicable to both CETA Prime Sponsors and JTPA Service Delivery Areas (SDAs);
- Utilization of the measures to assess the pre-JTPA ("baseline") coordination exhibited by a random sample of Prime Sponsors in Fiscal 1983;
- Utilization of the measures in a year or two in order to assess changes in the levels of coordination; and
- Analysis of the changes to determine the degree to which JTPA is achieving its coordination-oriented objectives.

This report summarizes the results of the first two steps, and explores their implications for JTPA program administrators, operators, and researchers. It is planned that the latter two steps will be undertaken by the Commission at some future date.

1.2 JTPA and Coordination

As Joseph Wholey has so forcefully pointed out in his "evaluability assessment" approach, those who would study social programs should specify their intended functioning before they attempt to collect and analyze data on actual functioning.

Those who drafted and enacted JTPA were clearly intent upon improving coordination among employment and training programs. system, and intended that the new program would help to overcome them. The selection of programs to be covered in this study, and the measures of coordination that are included in it have been derived from our understanding of the intentions of Congress with respect to coordination, based upon the wording of the Act.

The General Mandate to Coordinate

The JTPA legislation mandates the creation of numerous mechanisms designed to insure that activities funded under the Act will be coordinated with other related programs and services.

First, and perhaps foremost, State Governors are required to prepare a "Coordination and Special Services Plan" that will

> Establish criteria for coordinating activities under this Act with programs and services provided by State and local education and training agencies (including vocational education agencies, public assistance agencies, the employment service, rehabilitation agencies, postsecondary institutions, economic development agencies and such other agencies as the Governor determines to have a direct interest in employment and training and human resource utilization in the State. (Section 121 (b) (1))

Beyond this, all local job training plans for JTPA Service Delivery Areas (SDAs) are required to include a description of methods that will be used to comply with the Governor's plan (Section 104 (b)(7)), and Governors are required not to approve an SDA plan unless it complies with the criteria for coordination (Section 105 (b)(1)(E)).

In addition to this, the law states that funds provided under the Act shall not be used to duplicate facilities or services available in the area (with or without reimbursement from Federal, State, and local sources), unless it can be demonstrated that these alternative services would be more effective or more likely to achieve the service delivery area's performance goals.

Coordination with Specific Public Programs

This study focuses on coordination between CETA Prime Sponsors and six public agencies that are extensively referenced in JTPA, and which should, therefore, be the focus of SDA efforts to improve coordination. The six are: the public Employment Service (ES), public welfare (or public assistance), vocational education, other public education agencies (including community colleges), economic development agencies, and vocational rehabilitation agencies.

All of these six are explicitly referenced in the above-cited discussion of the Governor's Coordination and Special Services Plan (Section 121 (b)(1)), and all six are mentioned in the discussion of the required membership of the State Job Training Coordination Council (SJTCC) (Section 122 (a)(3)).

Five of the six agencies (all but public assistance) are addressed in the discussion of membership of local Private Industry Councils (PICs) (Section 102(b)), and four (all but ES and public education agencies) are mentioned in the mandate that the SJTCC assess the extent to which employment and training, vocational education, rehabilitation services, public assistance economic development, and other federal, state and local programs and services represent a consistent, integrated, and coordinated approach to meeting community needs (Section 122 (b)(7)(A)).

JTPA devotes additional explicit attention to relationships with the Employment Service, with welfare programs, and with education programs. Title V of the Act contains numerous amendments to the Wagner-Peyser Act that are designed to improve coordination between ES and SDAs. Particularly noteworthy are the joint planning requirements (Section 501 (d)) at the local (SDA) as well as the state (SJTCC) levels.

Service to welfare recipients is highlighted in the Act through mandating of welfare dependency reduction measures in the JTPA performance standards (Section 106 (b)). Furthermore, the Act amends the authorizing legislation for the Work Incentive (WIN) program by requiring that, where appropriate, WIN registrants are to be referred for training and employment services under the Job Training Partnership Act and by making other changes to bring the WIN planning system closer to that employed under JTPA. Finally, the Act mandates that WIN registrants be served on an "equitable basis" (Section 203 (b)(3)).

For these reasons, the discussion of coordination in this report addresses two distinct elements of coordination with welfare programs: general coordination with the public assistance agency, and specific coordination with the WIN program.

Efforts in the Act to promote coordination with education programs center on the 8% set-aside for cooperative agreements with State (and where appropriate Local) Education Agencies (Sections 123, and 202 (b)(1)), and the requirement that appropriate education agencies be provided the opportunity to provide educational services unless there are alternates that are demonstrated to be more effective (Section 107(c)). Pending legislation in the vocational education field contains still further efforts to improve coordination between the employment and training and education systems.

Coordination with the Private Sector

Although JTPA contains numerous specific references to improved coordination with publicly funded programs, the overall thrust of the Act has been to promote close links between the employment and training system and private employers. This intention is made concrete by mandating the co-equal role of the private sector in the Private Industry Councils (PICs) with local elected officials to oversee program planning and operation in local SDAs. The Act requires that representatives of the private sector constitute a majority of the membership of the council; that the chairman of the council be chosen from this group (Sections 102 (a) and (b)); and that the representatives of the private sector constitute at least a third of the SJTCC (Section 122 (a)(2)).

Given this general thrust in the JTPA legislation, this study has also therefore focused on Prime Sponsor efforts to coordinate their activities with private employers. In addition, it examines coordination with private for-profit deliverers of service, i.e. proprietary schools.

---

* Coordination with community based organizations (CBOs) was not a major focus of JTPA, and is therefore not addressed in this report. The involvement of CBOs in the FY 1983 CETA system is, however, addressed in detail in a companion final report for this study.

1.3 Summary of Methodology

The study methodology has encompassed two elements: development of operational measures of coordination, and obtaining information from Prime Sponsors about existing coordination using these measures.

The measures of coordination employed in the study were developed through a review of the CETA and pre-CETA research literature as well as studies of coordination in other human service programs, and through conversations with employment and training researchers and practitioners.

In particular, three types of measures have been utilized:

- Assessments of the current and past levels of coordination made by CETA Directors or their designees;
- Assessment of the extent to which structures and planning procedures to promote coordination are in place, such as
  - --Input from other agencies into the CETA planning process,
  - --Periodic meetings between the Prime Sponsor and other agencies, and
  - --Institution of superagencies that have authority over both the Prime Sponsors and the (public) agencies addressed in this study; and
- Assessment of the extent to which specific mechanisms to promote the desired results of coordination have been implemented, such as
  - --Formal client referral agreements,
  - --Co-location of offices,
  - --Uniform service boundaries,
  - --Joint funding agreements in which both CETA and another agency fund programs,
  - --Joint case teams, and
  - --Agreements between Prime Sponsors and others to specialize in different (types of) employers in their employer outreach efforts.

For the reasons cited above, attention has been devoted to obtaining information along these three dimensions in order to describe and analyze the relationships between Prime Sponsors and nine agencies and/or programs:

- The Work Incentive (WIN) program,
- The public Employment Service (ES) other than the ES components responsible for WIN,
- Agencies responsible for public welfare,
- Agencies responsible for vocational education,
- Public education agencies other than those responsible for vocational education,
- Proprietary schools,
- Economic development agencies,
- Agencies responsible for vocational rehabilitation, and
- Private employers.

A random sample of fifty Prime Sponsors was drawn in order to develop estimates of the levels, mechanisms, and results of coordination that could be reasonably extrapolated to the "typical Prime Sponsor" in the country as a whole. Given the findings of previous studies that CETA programming and activities often vary by type of Prime Sponsor, the sample was stratified along that dimension. The sample was also stratified by region of the country in order to guarantee broad geographic coverage.

In order to promote comparability with the emerging JTPA system, information was collected from portions of Balance of State Prime Sponsors that most closely resembled future JTPA Service Delivery Areas (SDAs) rather than from the Balance of State Prime Sponsor as a whole.

Finally, since a disproportionate amount of employment and training monies have always been spent by the largest grantees, a group consisting of the five Prime Sponsors with the largest total allocations was chosen for supplementary analysis.

Directors of the selected Prime Sponsors (or their designees) were contacted in August, 1983, in order to describe the study and to obtain commitments to provide information. All fifty-four of those contacted expressed a willingness to do so, and all were sent materials that described the measures of coordination to be employed in the study.*

---

* The fifty-four consisted of the fifty randomly selected Prime Sponsors and four of the five Prime Sponsors with the largest CETA allocations (New York City, Chicago, Los Angeles City and Los Angeles County). One of the five largest Prime Sponsors (Detroit) was already included in the random sample.

Information concerning the FY 83 status of coordination was obtained from Prime Sponsor officials during the months of September, October, November, and December of 1983; and January, February, and March of 1984. Useful information was obtained from 45 of the 50 randomly selected Prime Sponsors and three of the five largest ones by the early April deadline for inclusion in this report, yielding response rates of 90% and 60% respectively.

In all instances but two, the non-respondents have not declined to provide information; instead they consistently reported that they could not provide it in the immediate future but hoped to get to it soon. The explanations provided by the non-respondents for inability to meet a previous commitment to provide information varied, but often resulted from a failure to win redesignation as an SDA, resulting in lay-offs of all staff except a skeleton crew required to do close-outs and audits (an event that was sometimes unanticipated at the time of the August agreements to participate in the study). In two cases, Prime Sponsors mailed information that was never delivered, did not keep xerox copies and were unable to reassemble all of the needed information in a timely fashion. In one case, a severe health problem prevented the Prime Sponsor director from providing the information within the study deadlines.

Both respondents and non-respondents have faced unprecedented turmoil during the transition to JTPA, and most have experienced substantial cutbacks in staffing. Given this situation, the response rates obtained appear to be as high as could be expected.

The subsample of forty-five Prime Sponsors providing information for this report appears to be roughly representative of the fifty Prime Sponsor random sample and the universe of Prime Sponsors as a whole. However, as is illustrated in Exhibit 1-1 on the following page, cities and Prime Sponsors from Regions VII and VIII are somewhat underrepresented.*

The data were coded, entered into an IBM Personal Computer, and analyzed using MDA: Micro Data Analyzer software by Cambridge Information International, Inc.

---

* A complete list of the respondent and non-respondent Prime Sponsors is included as Appendix A to this report.

The data utilized in this report come exclusively from Prime Sponsor respondents. In many cases, these data vary from information about these Prime Sponsors that is available from the Department of Labor (DOL). For example, data on total allocations for 1983 are at variance with DOL data in roughly two-thirds of the cases. This fact, along with the decision to include just portions of BOS Prime Sponsors rather than the entire BOS, make it impossible to assess the representativeness of the sample by comparing statistics for the respondent sample with those for the universe of Prime Sponsors based on DOL data.

Exhibit 1-1

OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY SAMPLE OF FY 83 PRIME SPONSORS

	Universe		Sample		Respondents	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Type of Prime Sponsor						
County	195	(42)	20	(40)	18	(40)
Consortium	146	(32)	16	(32)	15	(33)
Balance of State	51	(11)	6	(12)	6	(13)
City	71	(15)	8	(16)	6	(13)
TOTAL	465		50		45	
Region						
Northeast (I,II,III)	134	(29)	15	(30)	13	(29)
Southeast (IV.VI)	113	(24)	11	(22)	11	(24)
Midwest (V)	106	(23)	12	(24)	11	(24)
Mountain & Central (VII,VIII)	42	(9)	4	(8)	3	(7)
West (IX,X)	70	(15)	8	(16)	7	(17)
TOTAL	465		50		45	

1.4 Organization of This Report

The remainder of this report consists of a presentation of the study findings concerning the status of coordination among CETA Prime sponsors in Fiscal 1983, along with a limited number of analyses of the extent to which the coordination varies by types of Prime Sponsor, region of the country, size of the Prime Sponsor, or length of time that the Prime Sponsor has been in operation. Extensive analysis of the data has not been attempted since the major purpose of the study is to provide baseline data for future analyses of change, not to conduct detailed analyses of the presence or absence of coordination in FY 83.

Chapter Two contains a summary of the study findings with respect to the FY 83 status of coordination for the random sample of Prime Sponsors, including discussions of:

- Assessments of the overall status of coordination,
- Presence of structures and planning procedures to promote general coordination, and
- Presence of specific mechanisms to promote coordination.

Chapter Three contains a discussion of Prime Sponsor perceptions about the dynamics of coordination during the last year of CETA. The topics addressed include factors that are believed to hamper effort to coordinate, and factors that are believed to facilitate coordination.

Chapter Four contains a brief summary of the implications of the study findings for those who are administering JTPA programs and for those who study them. As noted above, Appendix A contains a listing of Prime Sponsors included in this study. A brief comparison of the results obtained from the random sample with those in the largest Prime Sponsors is contained in Appendix B. Finally, Appendix C contains the detailed results of statistical tests that are referenced in the body of the report.

1.5 Highlights of Findings

Prime Sponsors Perceptions about Current Levels of Coordination

- Current levels of overall coordination are generally described as "good" by the typical Prime Sponsor. The mean score for all Prime Sponsors and all agencies was 2.91 on a scale in which scores of 1,2,3, and 4 were given for non-existent coordination, minimal coordination, good coordination, and excellent coordination respectively.

- Current levels of overall coordination are not related to type, age, or size of Prime Sponsors in a statistically significant fashion.

- Prime Sponsors report having the highest levels of coordination with public education agencies (with a mean score of 3.14) and the public Employment Service (with a mean score of 3.11).

- The next highest levels are with agencies responsible for vocational education and private employers (both with mean scores of 3.0).

- Prime Sponsors report substantially lower levels of coordination with the WIN program (with a mean score of 2.25) than with other agencies and programs (with the next lowest score being 2.78).

- Between a third and a half of Prime Sponsor respondents (31 to 50%) feel that there is a need to improve coordination with WIN, ES, welfare, vocational education, and public education agencies.

Structures and General Planning Procedures

- The overwhelming majority of Prime Sponsors have implemented procedures whose broad objectives involve promotion of coordination with related programs.

  --More than four-fifths of the Prime Sponsors providing information have input from vocational education (86%), employers (81%), and ES (81%) in their planning processes.

  --More than three-quarters of the Prime Sponsors providing information meet at least quarterly with ES (86%) and vocational education agencies (76%) for the purpose of promoting coordination.

- All coordination mechanisms studied were found least frequently with the WIN program; such measures were often present only half as often for WIN as for other programs.

  --Only 26% of the Prime Sponsors reported input from WIN into their planning process.

  --Only 29% reported meeting with WIN on at least a quarterly basis.

- In no instance did more than two-fifths of the Prime Sponsors report monthly meetings with any agency to promote coordination.

- There are only a handful of instances of superagencies having line authority over Prime Sponsors and the agencies addressed in this study.

Specific Mechanisms to Promote Coordination

- Formal client referral agreements were present twice as frequently with ES offices than with any other type of agency, occurring in about 45% of the Prime Sponsors providing information on this topic. However, this finding means that such agreements are not present in five of every nine instances, and thus confirms the general impression that there is considerable room for increasing coordination with the local Job Service and its programs in most places.

- Client referral agreements were present with welfare agencies and vocational rehabilitation agencies the next most frequently, 21% of the time.

- Just under a quarter of the Prime Sponsors providing data reported uniform service boundaries with ES, welfare, or vocational education (24% each). Roughly one in five reported uniform boundaries with agencies responsible for public education, economic development, and vocational rehabilitation (21%).

- Just over a third (36%) of the Prime Sponsors providing information reported co-location of at least some of their offices with the public Employment Service. Co-location was never encountered in more than one in six cases with other agencies.

- Just over two in five (45%) of responding Prime Sponsors reported having a formal client referral agreement with ES; this was roughly double the proportion for the agencies ranked second and third, welfare and vocational rehabilitation (21% each).

- Only three of 42 Prime Sponsors (7%) providing information reported having employer contact agreements in which job developers from different agencies specialized in different employers or different types of jobs with the same employer.

- Only seven of 42 Prime Sponsors (17%) reported eliminating a service that they had previously funded and subsequently referring clients who needed the service to another agency that provides it.

- Roughly one in six (17%) of Prime Sponsors reported having a joint funding agreement with vocational education in which both agencies contributed funds to the same project; this was the highest proportion of Prime Sponsors with which joint funding agreements that was encountered in the study.

- Just over one in five (21%) of the Prime Sponsors providing data reported having joint case teams for their clients who were also served by the vocational rehabilitation system. Joint case teams staffed by members of both agencies were reported by one of six Prime Sponsors describing service to welfare recipients.

Subcontracting

- Nearly half of the responding Prime Sponsors (48%) reported contracting with ES for outreach and recruitment, far outstripping the proportion of Prime Sponsors using any other agency for this purpose.

- Just over a third of the responding Prime Sponsors (36%) reported contracting with ES for intake and eligibility determination. The next highest proportion was 12% using public education agencies for this purpose.

- Roughly three in five Prime Sponsors (62%) reported contracting with vocational education agencies to deliver classroom skills training; roughly half contracted with public education agencies (48%) and proprietary schools (52%) for this purpose.

- Just under half of the reporting Prime Sponsors (43%) used public education agencies for classroom training for purposes other than conveying vocational skills--e.g. prevocational programs; roughly a third reported using proprietary schools for this purpose.

- The majority of Prime Sponsors (57%) reported contracting with private employers for on the job training (OJT).

- There was relatively little contracting reported for work experience with the agencies being addressed in this study.

- Roughly one in four Prime Sponsors (26%) reported utilizing ES for job search assistance. Just under one in five (19%) reported using proprietary schools for this purpose.

- The ES and proprietary schools were the agencies most utilized by Prime Sponsors in contracts for job development and/or placement, with reported use being just under a third (31%) in the former case and roughly a quarter (24%) in the latter.

- The ES, welfare, and WIN were the agencies most utilized to provide supportive services, but in no instance did more than one in six Prime Sponsors report subcontracting with any given type of agency for this purpose.

Dynamics of Coordination

- Prime Sponsor officials report that the most frequently encountered barriers to improved coordination with other agencies are "turf problems" and conflicting laws, goals, and priorities among different agencies.

- Prime Sponsors report that it, personal and inter-personal factors such as staff interest and goodwill are the most frequently encountered facilitater of coordination.

Chapter 2

STATUS OF COORDINATION IN FISCAL 1983

2.1 Introduction and Overview

This section of the report presents the study findings with respect to the status of coordination among the random sample of CETA Prime Sponsors in fiscal 1983. Included are discussions of:

- Perceived levels of coordination,
- Structures and planning procedures utilized to promote coordination, and
- Specific mechanisms to promote the desired results of coordination.

Wherever appropriate, assessments are made with respect to nine different types of agencies or programs:

- The Work Incentive (WIN) program,
- The Employment Service (ES) other than components that may be administering the WIN program,
- The agency responsible for public welfare,
- The agency responsible for vocational education,
- Other public education agencies,
- Proprietary schools,
- Economic development agencies,
- Vocational rehabilitation agencies, and
- Private employers.

The primary emphasis in this section is in reporting patterns which can be compared with the patterns that are emerging under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). However, in a limited number of instances, analyses of the FY 83 CETA patterns have been conducted in order to explore the relationship between aspects of coordination and such factors as:

- Length of time a Prime Sponsor has been in existence (comparing 32 Prime Sponsors that had been designated in the 1970s with 7 others that had been designated in 1980 or later),
- Type of Prime Sponsor,
- Region of the country in which the Prime Sponsor is located, and
- Size of the Prime Sponsor (in terms of total allocation of funds for FY 1983 and total planned participants).

2.2 Perceived Levels of Coordination

When given the chance to describe coordination with other agencies as non-existent, minimal, good, or excellent, the typical CETA Prime Sponsor director (or his or her designee*) chose the term "good". Using a rating scale in which these four levels of coordination were assigned scores of 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively, the mean score for all Prime Sponsors and all agencies was 2.91.**

As is shown in Exhibit 2-1 on the following page, the highest perceived levels of coordination were experienced with public education agencies with responsibilities other than vocational education and with the public Employment Service (ES). Prime Sponsor directors gave considerably lower ratings to coordination with the WIN program than any other agencies and programs.

---

* In order to improve the readability of this report, the phrase "or his or her designee" will not be reproduced after this point. Readers should recall, however, that in many cases, assessments were made by others. In most of these latter cases, however, the assessments were reviewed by the CETA directors before being finalized.

** Although the perceived levels of coordination represent a subjective measure, it is noteworthy that the ratings on this measure are closely related to much of the objective data on coordination obtained in this study, and the relationships are in the expected direction. For example, the perceived level of coordination with the ES has a strong positive relationship with such objective measures of coordination as referrals of participants from ES to CETA (r=.56) and from CETA to ES (r=.41).

Exhibit 2-1

PERCEIVED LEVELS OF COORDINATION*

	ALL PRIME SPONSORS	Old Prime Sponsors	New Prime Sponsors	County	Con-sortium	BOS	City
Coordination with							
Public Education Agencies	3.14 (35)**	3.22 (23)	3.20 (5)	3.31 (13)	3.00 (13)	2.80 (5)	3.50 (4)
ES	3.11 (38)	3.28 (25)	2.67 (6)	3.00 (14)	3.14 (14)	3.20 (5)	2.20 (5)
Voc. Ed.	3.00 (35)	3.09 (23)	3.17 (6)	3.15 (13)	3.00 (14)	2.75 (4)	2.75 (4)
Private Employers	3.00 (36)	3.08 (24)	3.17 (6)	3.21 (14)	3.07 (14)	2.60 (5)	2.33 (3)
Proprietary Schools	2.82 (34)	3.00 (23)	2.17 (6)	2.69 (13)	2.86 (14)	2.75 (4)	3.33 (3)
Welfare	2.81 (36)	3.04 (24)	2.17 (6)	3.00 (14)	2.71 (14)	2.60 (5)	2.67 (3)
Voc. Rehab.	2.80 (35)	2.92 (24)	2.50 (6)	3.07 (14)	2.71 (14)	2.75 (4)	2.00 (3)
Economic Development Agencies	2.78 (36)	2.71 (24)	3.17 (6)	2.79 (14)	2.71 (14)	2.75 (4)	3.00 (4)
WIN	2.25 (38)	2.29 (25)	2.00 (6)	2.36 (14)	2.33 (14)	3.50 (5)	1.50 (5)
MEAN SCORE FOR ALL AGENCIES	2.91 (35)	3.01 (24)	2.74 (5)	2.97 (13)	2.85 (13)	2.78 (4)	3.08 (4)

* Based on ratings in which 1 = non-existent
2 = minimal
3 = good
4 = excellent

** Numbers in parentheses are the number of observations.

The responses with respect to WIN merit further attention. Four of the 33 Prime Sponsors providing information on this issue described coordination with WIN as non-existent, and 20 described it as minimal, yielding a total of 24 out of 33 (73%) who gave a rating of less than "good." All four cases represent instances in which WIN programs were in effect in the Prime Sponsor's jurisdiction; they do not represent instances in which coordination was impossible because of the absence of a WIN program.

Comments of Prime Sponsor officials at these four sites include:

> Things are better now, but under CETA, I was unaware that WIN services were being provided by the public assistance agency in our area. I knew that there wasn't a separate WIN office in the county....
>
> I think there was a WIN program in our area, but we didn't have any coordination with them...
>
> We had no formal ties with the WIN program. We had had formal ties with them several years ago, but it just didn't work out.

In addition to these four Prime Sponsors, two others reported that there were no WIN programs in their jurisdiction. In one case, it was a rural county that was not covered by WIN; the other was a complicated situation in which the WIN program was not functioning for most of FY 1983 because of a decision to phase the program out which was later reversed.

Exhibit 2-1 also shows that the Prime Sponsors designated in the 1970s tend to have higher perceived levels of coordination with related agencies than those designated in the 1980s. However, analysis of variance tests show that no statistically significant differences exist among the mean scores for the two groups of Prime Sponsors.*

The exhibit also shows that there is no clear pattern relating types of Prime Sponsor and perceived levels of coordination. CETA directors from cities tended to have the highest levels of perceived coordination while those in the Balance of State (BOS) Prime Sponsors tended to have the lowest. But in no instance were there more than five respondents in either group, suggesting that there is little basis for generalization of these results to the 1983 CETA Prime Sponsor system as a whole.

---

* The results of the analysis of variance tests that are referenced in this chapter are summarized in Appendix C.

More generally, no statistically significant differences were found when analysis of variance tests were conducted to determine if the mean coordination score varied with type of Prime Sponsor, region of the country, size of the Prime Sponsor allocation in 1983, and the number of participants in 1983.

Perceived Need for Improvement in Coordination

As is illustrated in Exhibit 2-2 on the following page, between a third and a half of the Prime Sponsors offering opinions indicated that there was a need for improvement in coordination with WIN, ES, welfare, vocational education, and public education agencies. It is noteworthy that those Prime Sponsors who tended to perceive a need for improvement in coordination tended to he the same ones who made low subjective assessments of current levels of coordination.

The perceived need for improvement was greatest for welfare agencies and was least for agencies responsible for vocational education. With a single exception, the perceived need for improvement was higher among older Prime Sponsors and among cities. As discussed at several points in this report, however, the small numbers of new Prime Sponsors, cities, and Balance of State Prime Sponsors implies that extreme caution should be employed in interpreting these results.

2.3 Structures and Planning Procedures

There is a large number of procedures or structural reforms that agencies typically follow when they wish to improve coordination. Three of the most popular involve developing mechanisms to provide input into each other's planning processes, periodic meetings at which coordination can be discussed, and the development of "umbrella agencies" whose leadership have line authority over the agencies to be coordinated. The prevalence of each of these mechanisms for CETA Prime Sponsors in Fiscal 1983 is summarized below.

Input into the Planning Process

As is shown in Exhibit 2-3, the typical Prime Sponsor that provided information indicated that it received planning input from six of the nine agencies and programs addressed in this study. This mechanism was most prevalent between Prime Sponsors and agencies responsible for vocational education, the ES, and private employers. Each of these agencies was cited as having input by more than four-fifths of the Prime Sponsors who provided information (i.e. 86%, 81%, and 81% of the instances respectively).

Exhibit 2-2

PERCEIVED NEED FOR IMPROVEMENT IN COORDINATION*

	ALL PRIME SPONSORS	Old Prime Sponsors	New Prime Sponsors	County	Consortium	BOS	City
Coordination with							
Welfare Agencies	.50 (40)**	.52 (27)	.33 (6)	.38 (16)	.50 (14)	.60 (5)	.80 (5)
ES	.40 (40)	.37 (27)	.50 (6)	.38 (16)	.43 (14)	.20 (5)	.60 (5)
WIN	.39 (36)	.38 (26)	.20 (5)	.21 (14)	.43 (14)	.67 (3)	.60 (5)
Public Education Agencies	.38 (40)	.41 (27)	.17 (6)	.31 (16)	.36 (14)	.40 (5)	.60 (5)
Voc. Ed.	.31 (39)	.31 (26)	.00 (6)	.13 (15)	.29 (14)	.40 (5)	.80 (5)
MEAN SCORE FOR ALL AGENCIES	.39*** (36)	.41 (26)	.16 (5)	.27 (14)	.40 (14)	.47 (3)	.68 (5)

* Entries represent the proportion of Prime Sponsors in each category reporting that there is a need for improvement in coordination with the given agency.

** Numbers in parentheses are the number of observations.

***Entries represent the mean of the proportions for each of the five agencies listed in this exhibit.

Exhibit 2-3

PRESENCE OF MECHANISMS TO PROMOTE COORDINATION

Coordination with	Agency Has Input Into Prime Sponsor Planning	Prime Sponsor Meets at Least Quarterly	Prime Sponsor Meets at Least Monthly	Superagency Over Prime Sponsor and Agency	MEAN SCORE
Private Employers	.81 (43)**	.74 (42)	.36 (42)	n.a.	.64***
ES	.81 (43)	.86 (42)	.38 (42)	.02 (41)	.52
Voc. Ed.	.86 (43)	.76 (42)	.29 (42)	.02 (41)	.48
Public Education Agencies	.70 (43)	.67 (42)	.24 (42)	.02 (41)	.41
Economic Development Agencies	.64 (42)	.60 (42)	.33 (42)	.00 (41)	.39
Voc. Rehab.	.62 (42)	.50 (42)	.14 (42)	.00 (41)	.32
Welfare	.45 (42)	.50 (42)	.12 (42)	.07 (41)	.29
Proprietary Schools	.36 (42)	.31 (42)	.14 (42)	n.a.	.27
WIN	.26 (39)	.29 (41)	.07 (41)	.00 (39)	.16
MEAN SCORE FOR ALL AGENCIES	.62 (37)	.58 (41)	.22 (41)	.02 (39)	

* Entries represent the proportion of Prime Sponsors responding who reported the presence of a particular mechanism to promote coordination.

** Numbers in parentheses are the number of observations.

*** Entries represent the average of the scores in the first four columns.

More than three-fifths of the respondents reported having input from the agencies responsible for public education (70%), economic development (64%), and vocational rehabilitation (62%). Only one in four respondents (26%) reported input from the WIN program. As noted above, this low rate can not be attributed to the absence of a WIN program at rural locations because sites without WIN programs were eliminated from this analysis.

Meetings

The proportion of Prime Sponsors that reported meeting at least quarterly with other agencies was 50% or better for all agencies in the study except two. Only 31% reported meeting with representatives of proprietary schools as frequently as four times a year, and only 29% reporting having such meetings with staff from the WIN program.

At the other extreme, quarterly meetings with ES staff were reported by 86% of the responding Prime Sponsors, and similar meetings were encountered with representatives of vocational education agencies and private employers nearly as frequently (76% and 74% respectively).

The corresponding figures for monthly meetings are considerably lower, ranging from 7% for WIN and 12% for welfare to 36% for private employers and 38% for the public Employment Service.

Superagencies

Only a handful of Prime Sponsors reported having a superagency that had line authority over themselves and the other public agencies addressed in this study. In no instance did more than three Prime Sponsors report the presence of such a superagency over themselves and another given agency.

2.4 Specific Mechanisms to Promote Coordination

Both the research literature and common sense suggest that while increasing coordination procedures may be useful, it is the results of coordination that public policy-makers and administrators should be more concerned with. This study explored eight different mechanisms that are explicitly designed to promote one or more specific results of coordination:

- Formal written agreements to refer clients from one agency to another, thereby promoting the process of getting the client to the most appropriate agency;
- Creation of uniform and contiguous boundaries of the areas served by Prime Sponsors/SDAs and by others in order to simplify referrals and other efforts to work together in a cooperative fashion;
- Colocation of offices in the same building in order to ease client burden and promote formal and informal efforts at interagency coordination;
- Formal agreements in which job developers from two agencies agree to contact different employers, and/or specialize in different types of jobs at the same places of employment in order to reduce the burden on personnel officers in these firms who have to deal with many government programs, and to promote appropriate referrals for jobs;
- Responding to knowledge about duplication of services between the Prime Sponsor/SDA and another agency by eliminating funding for one of the programs, and referring clients with need for the service to the remaining service provider;
- Joint funding of some activities by Prime Sponsors/SDAs and other agencies, thereby developing programs that would probably not be possible if the resources of only one agency were available;
- Institution of formal procedures to create joint case teams for clients of the Prime Sponsor/SDA and another agency in order to promote coordination of service provision at the client level; and
- Prime Sponsor/SDA contracting for services from an agency that already provides the same or similar services rather than developing the independent capacity to provide them.

The first seven of these are discussed below. The eighth will be addressed in a subsequent sub-section.

Exhibit 2-4 shows that presence of uniform service boundaries and adoption of formal client referral agreements were the most frequently encountered results of coordination. The next most frequently encountered results were co-location, joint case teams, and jointly funded projects. However, with the exception of the Employment Service, in no case did more than a quarter of the Prime Sponsors report the presence of a given result of coordination with any given agency or program.

As is shown in Exhibit 2-4, coordination with the ES is reported more frequently than with any other agency. But it should be noted that fewer than half of the Prime Sponsors indicated that they had formal client referral agreements with ES offices (45%) and only about a third (36%) of the responding Prime Sponsors reported that they had co-located one or more of their services with the ES. Just under a quarter (24%) of the Prime Sponsors providing information reported common service boundaries with the ES.

In other words, although coordination with the ES is reported to be higher than is coordination with other agencies, these findings confirm the more general impression that there is considerable room for increasing coordination with the local Job Service and its programs in most places.

The next highest results of coordination were found with the agencies responsible for public welfare, vocational education, public education and vocational rehabilitation But it should be kept in mind that the reported levels were even lower than the [illegible] rates encountered for ES. In particular, desirable results of coordination were rarely encountered in more than 10% of the Prime Sponsors for any specific result of coordination and any specific type of agency.

2.5 Subcontracting with Other Agencies

Utilization of the capabilities of other agencies rather than duplicating them lies at the heart of the concept of coordination. Therefore, a careful effort was made to determine the extent to which Prime Sponsors were entering into financial agreements with each of the nine types of agencies and programs covered in this study in order to provide services on a subcontract basis.*

---

* Prime Sponsors also subcontract with other types of agencies, most notably community based organizations (CBOs), but since this is a study of coordination, subcontracting with agencies that are, in large part, dependent upon CETA for their employment and training funding is less relevant. The broader issues of subcontracting to any agency and non-financial agreements to provide services, are addressed in greater detail in the accompanying report on FY 83 CETA activities.

Exhibit 2-4 (a)

PRESENCE OF RESULTS OF COORDINATION*

Coordination with	Formal Client Referral Agreement	Uniform Service Boundaries	Colocation Of At Least Some Offices	Specialization of Job Developers	MEAN SCORE**
ES	.45***	.24	.36	.07	.17
Public Education Agencies	.12	.21	.17	.00	.11
Welfare	.21	.24	.12	.02	.10
Voc. Ed.	.12	.24	.12	.00	.10
Voc. Rehab.	.21	.21	.02	.00	.09
Economic Development Agencies	.02	.21	.02	.02	.07
Private Employers	.00	.10	.05	n.a.	.05
Proprietary Schools	.05	.07	.10	.00	.05
WIN	.14	.14	.05	.00	.05
MEAN SCORE FOR ALL AGENCIES	.15	.19	.12	.02	.09

* Entries represent the proportion of Prime Sponsors responding who reported the presence of a particular result of coordination.

** Entries represent the average of the scores in the first four columns of Exhibits 2-4 (a) and 2-4 (b), i.e. the average of eight numbers where data is present for all measures.

*** There are 42 observations in each cell.

Exhibit 2-4 (b)

PRESENCE OF RESULTS OF COORDINATION*

Coordination with	Prime Sponsor Eliminated An Activity And Now Refers Clients to the Agency	Agency Eliminated An Activity And Now Refers Clients to the Prime	Joint Funding of Some Services	Joint Case Teams	MEAN SCORE**
ES	.07***	.07	.12	.17	.17
Public Education Agencies	.17	.00	.14	.14	.11
Welfare	.05	.07	.02	.17	.10
Voc. Ed.	.10	.00	.19	.12	.10
Voc. Rehab.	.05	.02	.10	.21	.09
Economic Development Agencies	.02	.00	.17	.10	.07
Private Employers	.02	.00	.14	.05	.05
Proprietary Schools	.05	.00	.10	.07	.05
WIN	.00	.05	.02	.07	.05
MEAN SCORE FOR ALL AGENCIES	.06	.02	.11	.12	.09

* Entries represent the proportion of Prime Sponsors responding who reported the presence of a particular result of coordination.

** Entries represent the average of the scores in the first four columns of Exhibits 2-4 (a) and 2-4 (b), i.e. the average of eight numbers where data is present for all measures.

*** There are 42 observations in each cell.

All but two of the forty-two Prime Sponsors providing information for this aspect of the study reported subcontracting with at least one of the nine types of agencies for at least one service. As is shown in Exhibits 2-5 and 2-6, the Employment Service and the public education system were the most heavily utilized, followed by proprietary schools and vocational education agencies.

The Employment Service was used primarily for recruitment (nearly half the Prime Sponsors in the sample subcontracted with ES for this purpose), intake, job search assistance, and job development and placement. Vocational education other public education agencies, and proprietary schools were used primarily to provide classroom vocational skills training and other classroom training.

At the other extreme, scarcely any subcontracting agreements were entered into with the WIN program or with the agencies responsible for economic development and vocational rehabilitation. Prime Sponsors reporting subcontracting with private employers for all functions addressed in the study except for intake and eligibility determination.

2.6 Agency Specific Issues

Although this report has focused on generic measures of coordination, there are a number of measures which provide insights into the degree to which coordination is taking place with specific agencies that are central to the study of coordination of employment and training programs. These measures include the proportion of referrals to and from the ES from CETA intake, the utilization of WIN to provide supportive services for AFDC recipients, development of written agreements to use employment and training funds as part of a broader economic economic development strategy with private developers, and the utilization of existing educational facilities for the delivery of CETA funded services. A brief discussion of the FY 1983 status of coordination on each of these measures is presented below.

Employment Service

In an ideal world, Employment Service referrals of clients to and from the CETA/JTPA system would be brisk. As is shown in Exhibit 2-7 below, 42% of the CETA participants came from ES in the typical Prime Sponsor. Moreover, in the typical Prime Sponsor, about a quarter of the job ready men and women encountered at CETA intake were referred to ES for job development and placement.

The exhibit shows that referrals to and from the ES are more likely to have occurred in (components of) Balance of State Prime Sponsors than elsewhere.

Exhibit 2-5

PRESENCE OF RESULTS OF COORDINATION:

PRIME SPONSOR SUBCONTRACTS WITH OTHER AGENCIES

BY FUNCTION*

Coordination with	Recruitment	Intake	Serv.	Classroom Skills Training	Other Classroom	OJT	Work Exp.	Job Search Assist.	Job Dev't
ES	.48**	.36	.17	.07	.00	.19	.07	.26	.31
Public Education Agencies	.19	.12	.07	.48	.45	.10	.12	.12	.21
Prop. Schools	.10	.05	.02	.52	.31	.05	.05	.19	.24
Private Employers	.07	.00	.07	.19	.07	.57	.07	.07	.05
Voc. Ed.	.05	.02	.05	.62	.19	.00	.00	.05	.17
Economic Development Agencies	.07	.02	.02	.00	.02	.05	.02	.07	.10
Voc. Rehab.	.12	.00	.12	.05	.02	.00	.02	.05	.02
Welfare	.10	.00	.12	.00	.00	.00	.00	.02	.05
WIN	.05	.00	.12	.00	.02	.00	.00	.02	.00
MEAN SCORE FOR ALL AGENCIES	.13	.06	.08	.21	.12	.11	.04	.10	.13

* Entries represent the proportion of Prime Sponsors providing information that report the presence of one or more subcontracts to perform a given function.

** The number of observations in each cell is 42.

Exhibit 2-6

PRESENCE OF RESULTS OF COORDINATION:

PRIME SPONSOR SUBCONTRACTS WITH OTHER AGENCIES

BY GROUPS OF FUNCTIONS*

Coordination with	ALL** FUNCTIONS	Recruitment & Intake	Training***	Placement****
ES	.21*****	.42	.08	.29
Public Education Agencies	.21	.15	.29	.17
Prop. Schools	.17	.07	.23	.21
Private Employers	.13	.04	.23	.06
Voc. Ed.	.13	.04	.20	.11
Eco. Dev't	.04	.05	.02	.08
Voc. Rehab.	.04	.06	.02	.04
Welfare	.03	.05	.00	.04
WIN	.02	.02	.01	.01
MEAN SCORE FOR ALL AGENCIES	.11	.10	.12	.11

* Entries represent the average score for each Prime Sponsor across the group of functions that is encompassed in each column, based on the entries in Exhibit 2-5.

** Entries represent the average of all nine functions.

*** Training encompasses classroom skills training other classroom training, OJT, and work experience.

****Placement encompasses job development and job search assistance.

***** The number of entries in each cell is 42.

Exhibit 2-7 (a)

AGENCY-SPECIFIC INDICATORS OF COORDINATION

	ALL PRIME SPONSORS	Old Prime Sponsors	New Prime Sponsors	County	Consortium	BOS	City
Employment Service							
Proportion of CETA participants who come from ES intake	41.54 (39)*	38.50 (28)	38.00 (5)	28.00 (15)	46.77 (13)	72.40 (5)	38.33 (6)
Proportion of job ready men and women who are referred to ES for job development from CETA intake	25.32 (22)	23.08 (13)	16.67 (3)	24.17 (6)	6.43 (7)	53.40 (5)	25.00 (4)
WIN							
Proportion of AFDC recipients on the CETA rolls receiving supportive services from WIN	17.96 (24)	21.22 (18)	10.00 (2)	12.11 (9)	29.00 (10)	3.00 (4)	20.00 (1)
Economic Development							
Number of agreements with private sector developers	1.79 (28)	1.00 (19)	1.33 (3)	0.75 (8)	1.08 (12)	1.50 (4)	6.25 (4)

* Numbers in parentheses represent the numbers of Prime Sponsors providing information on each item.

Exhibit 2-7 (b)

AGENCY-SPECIFIC INDICATORS OF COORDINATION

(continued)

	ALL PRIME SPONSORS	Old Prime Sponsors	New Prime Sponsors	County	Consortium	BOS	City
Public Education							
Proportion of vocational skills training participants trained in facilities owned or operated by local public education agencies	50.38 (39)	46.43 (28)	74.00 (5)	44.27 (15)	59.36 (14)	55.00 (5)	39.00 (5)
Proprietary Schools							
Proportion of classroom-sized vocational skills training participants trained in proprietary schools	23.23 (39)	24.96 (27)	10.00 (6)	28.27 (15)	14.64 (14)	32.40 (5)	23.00 (5)

WIN

If coordination with the WIN program were smooth, one might expect a considerable number of CETA participants who were on the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) welfare program to receive supportive services from WIN. As is shown in the exhibit, however, only about one in six CETA participants (18%) who receive AFDC are in fact obtaining such services from WIN in the typical Prime Sponsor.

Utilization of WIN for this purpose was reported more frequently among Prime Sponsors designated in the 1970s than those designated in the 1980s. However, the small number of Prime Sponsors for whom information is available makes it difficult to generalize about the impact of type of Prime Sponsor on this issue.

Economic Development

Healthy ties between CETA/JTPA and economic development programs might be evidenced by written agreements to use employment and training funds as part of a broader strategy with private developers. The exhibit shows that there were relatively little activities of this nature among any type of Prime Sponsor.*

Utilization of Existing Educational Facilities to Train Participants

Utilization of facilities owned by public education agencies and by proprietary schools for classroom size skills training appear to be desirable outcomes of efforts to promote coordination and to minimize duplication. The exhibit demonstrates that about half (50%) of the FY 1983 CETA participants who received classroom skills training at a typical Prime Sponsor received the services in facilities owned or operated by public education agencies, and roughly a quarter were trained in proprietary school facilities.

Statistical Relationships

As is shown in Appendix C to this report, analysis of variance tests show that none of the above-listed agency-specific measures of coordination were related to age, size, and type of Prime Sponsor or to region of the country. The one statistically significant relationship is an artifact of a single outlying score on the number of agreements with developers.

---

* Although most Prime Sponsors reported fewer than ten agreements, one reported a total of 1200, and another reported 21. The former was eliminated from the analysis; the latter was not.

Chapter 3

THE DYNAMICS OF COORDINATION

3.1 Introduction

This section of the report contains the perceptions of Prime Sponsor staff about the factors that facilitate and hamper their efforts to promote coordination between their agencies and the WIN program, ES, welfare agencies, vocational education, and other public education agencies.

The opinions expressed on these topics were highly ideosyncratic and difficult to group together and summarize. Even with a liberal aggregation of answers, in no case was a given response obtained more than thirteen times. Moreover, the frequency of responses can be deceiving since a given Prime Sponsor official could have provided it five times, once for each of the five agencies addressed in this aspect of the study.

3.2 Factors Hampering Coordination

Prime Sponsor officials provided a wide range of responses to an open-ended inquiry about barriers to coordination between their agencies and others. As is shown in Exhibit 3-1 on the following page, "turf problems" and competition among agencies were cited most frequently overall.

Staff shortages and conflicts in authorizing legislation, goals, and priorities, were cited the second most frequently. "Bureaucratic inflexibility" and poor communication were the next most frequently cited factors. In eight instances, Prime Sponsor respondents indicated that there were no factors hampering coordination with a given agency that they could think of.

In response to a related inquiry about reasons why coordination was not better, the second most frequently provided reason was "have not tried". No explanations were given as to why efforts to coordinate were not undertaken, but this issue clearly merits further attention.

Prime Sponsor officials cited the greatest number of barriers in their discussions of the public Employment Service, although there was little variation from agency to agency.

Exhibit 3-1

FACTORS HAMPERING COORDINATION*

Factors	WIN	ES	Welfare	Voc. Ed.	Pub. Ed.	
"Turf problems", competition	2	4	2	2	2	12
Conflicting laws, goals, or priorities	1	0	2	2	3	8
Shortages in staff and/or funding	0	2	2	2	2	8
Bureaucratic inflexibility	2	2	1	1	1	7
Poor communication	1	1	2	2	1	7
Lack of a mechanism to promote coordination	1	1	1	1	1	5
Apathy	0	1	1	2	0	4
Other	5	6	3	0	3	17
None	2	1	2	2	1	8
TOTAL	15	18	18	16	17	84

* Each entry represents the number of times that a given factor was cited by a staff member of a Prime Sponsor with respect to a specific agency with which coordination was desired.

3.2 Factors Promoting Coordination

Exhibit 3-2 summarizes the responses received concerning factors that are considered to be facilitating coordination. As is shown in the exhibit, the respondents mention personal and interpersonal factors far more frequently than they discuss institutional or policy-related factors.

In particular, the most frequently cited facilitating factor was interest and support for coordination on the part of line staff. Interpersonal factors such as rapport, good communication skills, good will, and a spirit of cooperation were the second most frequently cited cluster of factors. The role of key people was cited the third most frequently. Institutional and/or policy-related factors such as membership on an advisory council, passage of the Job Training Partnership Act, and joint planning activities were the next most frequently cited factors.

Prime Sponsor respondents provided a somewhat longer list of factors facilitating coordination with the Employment Service welfare, and vocational education than for the other two agencies.

Exhibit 3-2

FACTORS PROMOTING COORDINATION*

Factors	WIN	ES	Welfare	Voc. Ed.	Pub. Ed.	
Interest and support on the part of line staff	1	2	4	4	2	13
Interpersonal factors, e.g. rapport, good will, cooperation	1	3	2	3	2	11
Role of key people	0	2	1	3	2	8
Advisory council membership	1	2	2	0	2	7
JTPA	1	2	2	1	1	7
Joint planning	1	1	0	2	2	6
Monthly meetings	1	1	1	1	1	5
State mandate/state leadership	1	3	1	0	0	5
Common goals	0	1	1	2	1	5
Other	4	4	6	6	1	21
TOTAL	11	23	21	25	16	94

* Each entry represents the number of times that a given factor was cited by a staff member of a Prime Sponsor with respect to a specific agency with which coordination was desired.

Chapter 4

IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY-MAKERS AND FUTURE RESEARCHERS

4.1 Introduction

As noted in Chapter 1, the primary purpose of this study has been to "take a snapshot" of the status of coordination during the last year of operation of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) in order to facilitate analysis of changes that will be taking place during the early years of the implementation of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). However, several of the findings of the study are noteworthy in and of themselves, and merit attention from those responsible for administering the JTPA system even before the second round of this study is undertaken. A summary of some of the most salient of these is presented below.

4.2 Low Levels of Coordination with WIN

The low levels of coordination between CETA Prime Sponsors and the Work Incentive (WIN) program represent perhaps the most striking of the study findings. As discussed in Chapter 2, coordination with WIN was perceived to be considerably lower than coordination with the eight other programs and agencies addressed in the study; Prime Sponsors tended to have developed markedly fewer coordination mechanisms with WIN than with the other agencies; and the WIN program was tied for the lowest levels of achievement of desirable benefits of coordination.

The strong JTPA emphasis on reducing welfare dependency makes it imperative that close ties be developed and maintained between the administrative entities responsible for Service Delivery Areas and programs designed to help welfare recipients to get jobs.

Despite considerable ferment in the WIN system, the WIN program (and the related "WIN demonstration" programs that have replaced WIN in about half of the states) remain the focus of efforts to help welfare recipients obtain employment. Therefore, it seems clear that efforts to promote coordination with WIN should be a high priority for SDAs.

4.3 The Need for Further Attention to Coordination with ES

As was discussed in Chapter 2, coordination with the public Employment Service is relatively high--often the highest among the nine public and private agencies covered in this study--but it still far from universally realized. For example, despite the fact that client referral agreements were more frequently encountered with ES than with any other program or agency, such agreements were still present in fewer than half of the Prime Sponsors providing information.

Given the heavy emphasis on improving ties between Prime Sponsors and the Employment Service in the past, the levels of coordination discussed in this report suggest that further attention should be paid to this issue, and in particular, to the factors that have promoted and impeded such coordination in the past--and are likely to continue to do so in the future.

4.4 The Relationship between Coordination Mechanisms and Results

Comparison of the data in the exhibits presented in Chapter 2 makes it clear that the fact that coordinated planning is frequently encountered does not automatically translate into the frequent presence of specific mechanisms to promote coordination. Both program administrators and operators would therefore do well to distinguish between means such as coordinated planning procedures, interme as written referral agreements, and ends such as improved service and/or reduced costs, and to focus their efforts on achieving the latter two.

4.5 The Need for Continued Close Attention to Coordination

As noted in Chapter 3, the study findings point up that competition among agencies and/or differences in priorities between employment and training agencies and others are considered important barriers to improved coordination. These areas have been partially addressed in the JTPA legislation, and there is therefore some reason to expect that improvements in coordination will take place during the early years of implementation of the Act.

The best way to obtain reasonably accurate estimates of the degree to which these desired changes are taking place would be to replicate this study, obtaining information on the precise measures utilized in this study from the SDAs responsible for the same areas of the study Prime Sponsorships at some time in the next few years.

Appendix A

PRIME SPONSOR SAMPLES

A. The Random Sample

Counties	Consortia
*Bucks (PA)	*Albany City (NY)
*Balance of Albany (NY)	*New Bedford (MA)
*Cape May (NJ)	*Broome/Tioga (NY)
*Monmouth (NJ)	*Suffolk (NY)
*Camden (NJ)	*Gulf Coast (MISS)
Balance of Essex (NJ)	*Montgomery (AL)
*Delaware (PA)	*Mid-Georgia
*Lake (FL)	*CSRA (GA)
*Balance of Tarrant (TX)	*Capital Area (TX)
*Webb (TX)	*Madison (IL)
*Cameron (TX)	*Southwestern (IN)
Trumbull (OH)	*Michiana (IN)
*Livingston (MI)	*Muskegon (MI)
*Balance of Hamilton (OH)	Topeka (KA)
*McHenry (IL)	*Takoma/Pierce (WA)
*Balance of Lake (IL)	*Balance of Alameda (CA)
*Davis (UT)	
*Monterrey (CA)	
*Santa Cruz (CA)	
*Balance of Santa Clara (CA)	

Balance of State	Cities
*West Virginia	Scranton (PA)
*New Jersey	*Newark (NJ)
*New Mexico	*Little Rock
*Indiana	*Cleveland (OH)
*Missouri	*Detroit (MICH)
*Arizona	*St. Louis (MO)
	*Long Beach (CA)
	Eugene (OR)

B. Large Prime Sponsor Supplementary Group

*New York City	Los Angeles County
*Los Angeles (City)	*Chicago

---

* Prime Sponsors that provided useful information for the study.

Appendix B

COMPARISONS OF RANDOM SAMPLE AND LARGE PRIME SPONSOR GROUP

1.0 Introduction

This report has focused primarily upon information provided from a random sample of 1983 CETA Prime Sponsors. This sample, included only one of the five largest Prime Sponsors in terms of total allocations of funds. Since such a large proportion of CETA funding has been expended by a handful of the largest Prime Sponsors, a supplementary analysis has been conducted.

Information was requested from the remaining four of the five largest Prime Sponsors, and all agreed to provide it. However, the responses from two of them have been delayed. Exhibit B-1 on the following page summarizes the differences in characterstics of the random sample and the three responding large Prime Sponsors (including one Prime Sponsor that is in both groups). Exhibits B-2 through B-6 illustrate the differences in mean values of the random sample and large prime sponsor groups for each of the variables discussed in Section 2 of this report.

The highlights of these comparisons appear below. But readers should remember that relatively little can be generalized about the differences between the two groups since two of the five large Prime Sponsors have not yet responded; the proportions of Prime Sponsors in the large group could change radically with the addition of even one of the two.

2.0 Perceived Levels of Coordination

Respondents from large Prime Sponsor tend to report less coordination than their counterparts in the random sample. Exhibit B-2 shows that this is the case for six of the nine agencies studied; all except vocational education, other public education, and proprietary schools. All three large Prime Sponsor respondents saw a need to improve coordination with ES and welfare agencies.

3.0 Types of Coordination

As is shown in Exhibit B-3, no clear patterns emerge with respect to differences in types of coordination--except perhaps the fact that large Prime Sponsors may place a lower reliance upon monthly meetings than do the typical (random) Prime Sponsors.

Exhibit B-1

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RANDOM AND LARGE PRIME SPONSOR SAMPLES

	Random Prime Sponsors (n=43)	Large Prime Sponsors (n=3)
Type		
County	17 (40%)	--
Consortium	15 (35%)	--
Balance of State	6 (14%)	--
City	5 (12%)	3 (100%)
Region		
Northeast (I-III)	12 (28%)	--
Southeast (IV,VI)	11 (26%)	--
Midwest (V)	11 (26%)	2 (67%)
Mountain/ Central (VII,VIII)	3 (7%)	--
West (IX,X)	6 (14%)	1 (33%)
Mean 1983 Allocation	$ 4,704,000	$40,184,000
Mean 1983 Participants	2,624	26,965
Mean Population	376,000	2,392,000
Mean Unemployment Rate	11.3%	16.4%
Proportion Designated as Prime Sponsors in 1970s	.83	1.00

Exhibit B-2

PERCEIVED LEVELS OF COORDINATION

	Current Status*		Need for Improvement**	
	Random (n=35)	Large (n=3)	Random (n=35)	Large (n=3)
Mean Coordination with				
WIN	2.25	1.67	.39	.00
ES	3.11	2.67	.40	1.00
Welfare	2.81	2.67	.50	1.00
Voc. Ed.	3.00	3.33	.31	.33
Public Education	3.14	3.33	.38	.33
Proprietary Schools	2.82	3.00	--	--
Economic Development	2.78	2.67	--	--
Voc. Rehabilitation	2.80	2.33	--	--
Private Employers	3.00	2.33	--	--
ALL AGENCIES	2.91	2.67	.39	.53

* Based on ratings in which
1 = non-existent
2 = minimal
3 = good
4 = excellent

** Proportion of Prime Sponsors in category reporting that there is a need for improvement in coordination with the given agency.

Exhibit B-3

PRESENCE OF COORDINATION MECHANISMS*

	Input into Planning		Quarterly Meetings		Monthly Meetings		Superagency Over Both	
	R**	L**	R	L	R	L	R	L
Coordination with								
WIN	.26	.33	.22	.33	.07	.00	n.a.	.00
ES	.81	.67	.55	.67	.38	.00	.02	.00
Welfare	.45	.67	.38	.67	.12	.00	.07	.00
Vocational Education	.86	.67	.50	.67	.29	.00	.02	.00
Public Education	.69	.67	.48	.67	.24	.00	.02	.00
Proprietary Schools	.36	.67	.19	.33	.14	.00	n.a.	n.a.
Economic Development	.64	.67	.33	.67	.33	.00	.00	.00
Vocational Rehabilitation	.62	.67	.36	.33	.14	.00	.00	.00
Private	.81	.67	.45	.67	.36	.00	n.a.	n.a.
ALL	.62	.63	.38	.56	.22	.00	.02	.00

* Entries represent proportion of Prime Sponsors reporting each type of coordination.

**KEY: R refers to random sample (n=37 for input, 41 for meetings, and 39 for presence of a superagency)

L refers to the large Prime Sponsor group (n=3)

4.0 Results of Coordination

Random Prime Sponsors were somewhat more likely to report the presence of six of the eight results of coordination described in Exhibit B-4. The two exceptions were presence of a formal client referral agreement, and presence of jointly funded programs.

5.0 Subcontracting

Large Prime Sponsor reposndents were more likely to subcontract all but one of the nine functions addressed in Exhibit B-5. The one exception was intake and eligibility determination.

6.0 Agency Specific Data

Large Prime Sponsor respondents were more likely to assign substantial proportions of their vocational skills training participants to public education agencies and less likely to send them to proprietary schools. Large Prime Sponsor job developers were not active at all during the final month of CETA.

Exhibit 3-4(a)

PRESENCE OF RESULTS OF COORDINATION*

	Uniform Boundaries		Colocation		Formal Client Referral Agreement		Formal Agreement To Specialize In Employers	
	R**	L**	R	L	R	L	R	L
Coordination with								
WIN	.14	.00	.05	.00	.14	.33	.00	.00
ES	.24	.00	.36	.33	.45	.67	.07	.00
Welfare	.24	.00	.12	.00	.21	1.0	.02	.00
Vocational Education	.24	.00	.12	.00	.12	.33	.00	.00
Public Education	.21	.00	.17	.00	.12	.33	.00	.00
Proprietary Schools	.07	.00	.10	.00	.05	.33	.00	.00
Economic Development	.21	.33	.10	.00	.02	.33	.02	.00
Vocational Rehabilitation	.21	.00	.02	.00	.21	.33	.00	.00
Private Employers	.10	.00	.05	.00	.00	.33	n.a.	n.a.
ALL AGENCIES	.19	.04	.12	.04	.15	.33	.02	.00

* Entries represent proportion of Prime Sponsors reporting each result of coordination.

**KEY: R refers to random sample (n=42)

L refers to the large Prime Sponsor group (n=3)

Exhibit B-4(b)

PRESENCE OF RESULTS OF COORDINATION*

	CETA Eliminated Program And Refers To Agency		Agency Eliminated Program And Refers to CETA		Jointly Funded Programs		Joint Case Teams	
	R**	L**	R	L	R	L	R	L
Coordination with								
WIN	.00	.00	.05	.00	.02	.00	.07	.00
ES	.07	.00	.07	.00	.12	.00	.07	.00
Welfare	.05	.00	.07	.00	.02	.00	.17	.00
Vocational Education	.10	.00	.00	.00	.19	.33	.12	.00
Public Education	.17	.00	.00	.00	.14	.33	.14	.00
Proprietary Schools	.05	.00	.00	.00	.10	.00	.07	.00
Economic Development	.02	.00	.00	.00	.17	.00	.10	.00
Vocational Rehabilitation	.05	.00	.02	.00	.10	.33	.21	.00
Private Employers	.02	.00	.00	.00	.14	.33	.05	.00
ALL AGENCIES	.06	.00	.02	.00	.11	.15	.12	.00

* Entries represent proportion of Prime Sponsors reporting each result of coordination.

**KEY: R refers to random sample (n=42)

L refers to the large Prime Sponsor group (n=3)

Exhibit B-5(a)

PRESENCE OF SUBCONTRACTING*

	Recruitment		Intake		Classroom Skills Training		Other Classroom Training	
	R**	L**	R	L	R	L	R	L
Coordination with								
WIN	.05	.33	.00	.33	.00	.00	.02	.00
ES	.48	.33	.36	.33	.07	.00	.07	.00
Welfare	.10	.33	.00	.33	.00	.00	.00	.00
Vocational Education	.05	.33	.02	.67	.62	.33	.19	.33
Public Education	.19	.33	.12	.33	.48	.67	.45	.67
Proprietary Schools	.10	.67	.05	.67	.52	1.0	.31	1.0
Economic Development	.07	.33	.02	.33	.00	.33	.02	.33
Vocational Rehabilitation	.12	.67	.00	.67	.05	.33	.02	.33
Private Employers	.07	.33	.00	.33	.19	.67	.07	.67
ALL AGENCIES	.13	.41	.61	.44	.21	.37	.12	.37

* Entries represent proportion of Prime Sponsors a subcontract with each agency for each function

**KEY: R refers to random sample (n=42) for recruitment, classroom skills training and other classroom training and (n=39) for intake

L refers to the large Prime Sponsor group (n=3)

Exhibit B-3(b)

PRESENCE OF SUBCONTRACTING*

	OJT		Work Experience		Job Search Assistance		Job Development/ Placement		Supportive Services	
	R**	L**	R	L	R	L	R	L	R	L
Coordination with										
WIN	.00	.00	.00	.00	.02	.33	.00	.00	.12	.00
ES	.19	.00	.07	.00	.26	.67	.31	.33	.17	.00
Welfare	.00	.00	.00	.00	.02	.33	.05	.00	.12	.33
Vocational Education	.00	.33	.00	.33	.05	.33	.17	.33	.05	.33
Public Education	.10	.33	.12	1.0	.12	.67	.21	.67	.07	.33
Proprietary Schools	.05	.33	.05	1.0	.19	1.0	.24	1.0	.02	.33
Economic Development	.05	.33	.02	.33	.07	.33	.10	.67	.02	.33
Vocational Rehabilitation	.00	.33	.02	.67	.05	.67	.02	.67	.12	.33
Private Employers	.57	.67	.07	.33	.07	.67	.05	.67	.07	.33
ALL AGENCIES	.11	.26	.04	.41	.10	.56	.13	.48	.08	.26

* Entries represent proportion of Prime Sponsors a subcontract with each agency for each function

**KEY: R refers to random sample (n=42)

L refers to the large Prime Sponsor group (n=3)

Exhibit B-6

AGENCY-SPECIFIC INDICATORS OF COORDINATION

	Random Prime Sponsors (n=43)	Large Prime Sponsors (n=3)
Employment Service		
Proportion of CETA participants who come to the program from ES intake	.40	.15
Proportion of job ready men and women who are referred to ES for job development and placement from CETA intake	.25	*
WIN		
Proportion of AFDC recipients on the CETA rolls receiving supportive services from WIN	.18	**
Economic Development		
Mean number of agreements with private sector developers	1.79	.67
Education Agencies		
Proportion of vocational skills training participants trained in facilities owned or operated by local public education agencies	.50	.19
Proportion of classroom-sized vocational skills training participants trained in proprietary schools	.23	.52

* Only one of the three large Prime Sponsors provided data.

** None of the three large Prime Sponsors provided data.

Appendix C

RESULTS OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TESTS

FROM CHAPTER TWO

	R-squared*	F-test	
A. Mean Coordination Score			
Old versus new Prime Sponsors	.05	(1,27)	1.45
Type of Prime Sponsor	.04	(3,31)	.43
Total allocation, FY 83	.04	(1,32)	1.20
Total participants, FY 83	.01	(1,32)	.33
Region	.13	(4,30)	1.16
B. CETA Participants from ES Intake			
Old versus new Prime Sponsors	.00	(1,30)	.01
Type of Prime Sponsor	.17	(3,34)	2.33
Total allocation, FY 83	.04	(1,33)	1.29
Total participants, FY 83	.00	(1,33)	.10
Region	.03	(4,33)	.26
C. Referrals to ES from CETA Intake			
Old versus new Prime Sponsors	.01	(1,14)	.08
Type of Prime Sponsor	.21	(3,18)	1.56
Total allocation, FY 83	.10	(1,18)	2.05
Total participants, FY 83	.03	(1,18)	.60
Region	.17	(4,17)	.84
D. Receipt of Supportive Services from WIN			
Old versus new Prime Sponsors	.01	(1,18)	.27
Type of Prime Sponsor	.15	(3,20)	1.17
Total allocation, FY 83	.00	(1,19)	.02
Total participants, FY 83	.01	(1,19)	.12
Region	.07	(4,19)	.36

* F-test scores were calculated using multiple regression techniques in a statistical package.

Appendix C

RESULTS OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TESTS

FROM CHAPTER TWO

(continued)

	R-squared	F-test	
E. Number of Agreements with Private Sector Developers			
Old versus new Prime Sponsors	.01	(1,20)	.15
Type of Prime Sponsor	.21	(3,24)	2.12
Total allocation, FY 83	.01	(1,24)	.12
Total participants, FY 83	.01	(1,24)	.01
Region	.87	(4,23)	40.73*
F. Proportion of Skills Training Participants Trained in Public Education Agencies			
Old versus new Prime Sponsors	.08	(1,31)	2.56
Type of Prime Sponsor	.05	(3,35)	.65
Total allocation, FY 83	.06	(1,34)	2.04
Total participants, FY 83	.04	(1,34)	1.45
Region	.14	(4,34)	1.42
G. Proportion of Skills Training Participants Trained in Proprietary Schools			
Old versus new Prime Sponsors	.04	(1,31)	1.40
Type of Prime Sponsor	.06	(3,35)	.72
Total allocation, FY 83	.05	(1,34)	1.76
Total participants, FY 83	.06	(1,34)	2.08
Region	.21	(4,34)	2.22

* Significant at the .01 level.